The Oxford Movement and the Catholic Revival

A Paper Read by the

REV. ROYDEN KEITH YERKES, PH.D., S.T.D.

Before The Church Club of Philadelphia

October 30th, 1933

[Printed by The Church Club of Philadelphia]

THE OXFORD MOVEMENT AND THE CATHOLIC REVIVAL.

A Paper Read Before the Church Club of Philadelphia, October 30, 1933.

The Catholic Congress is over. One may well suppose that there is no phase of the Oxford Movement which has not been presented and embellished. The inestimable benefits resulting from the fearless activities of the courageous heroes of the century just past, and the equally inestimable hopes of the equally fearless activities of enthusiastic devotees of the century to come, have been portrayed in appealing and attractive manner. Nor have we been left unmindful of the insidious dangers in store for unthinking converts who are too easily beguiled by the siren voices of furtive propagandists who cleverly obscure their deep and dark designs. The obverse and the reverse of the coin have been subjected to most rigid scrutiny by those who are convinced that it is pure gold and by those who still insist that it is but gilded brass or lead. Blame not an observer who, ten days ago, did not know the difference between the Oxford Movement and the Oxford Group Movement, for pausing to ask just what it is all about. Therefore in this, the aftermath of the jubilee whose loud plaudits have not been altogether unmixed with an honest and ingenuous hiss, one may well make a factual examination of the purpose and the work of the Movement.

For our study we shall call *a* church "a religious organization", assuming that we all have some idea of what we mean by "organization" and by "religious". We may, for a beginning, grant any shade of meaning desired for either term, and speak freely of the ancient Egyptian church, of the churches of ancient Rome, of Babylon and of classic Greece, of Buddhist and Mohammedan and Shinto and Confucian and Christian churches. Every imaginable kind of religious organization is to be accepted as a church, for every one has some sort of lofty aims and motives, and every one has features that are not altogether lovely. Taking all the churches of the world, we may group them into three classes, depending upon the basic conception held by each of what constitutes a church. In no class is this basic conception wholly unalloyed; nevertheless, even a tyro can distinguish between a twenty carat lump of gold and a lump which contains but half a carat.

There is, first, that theory which describes the church as the aesthetico-moral department of the State. Its officials are appointed by the State; its cult is controlled by the State; its purpose is the well-being of the State; its destiny is determined by the State. Such were the churches of ancient Babylon and Egypt and such was that of ancient Rome. This idea dominated the Church of Tsarist Russia and motivates the German Church today; it was the fairly common understanding of the Church of England of a hundred years ago; its influence there today is by some regarded as the hope of salvation of that Church and by others considered the menace of its very existence.

The State, as a political entity, has two main objects: the solidification and preservation of itself and, presumably, the greatest good of the greatest number of its members. It may create, neglect or dissolve any department in order to effect its purpose. In pre-Augustan Rome the department of religion was of so little consequence that it was allowed to dwindle to a skeleton of largely neglected ceremonies continued by a few appointees whose number was gradually diminishing. The emperor Augustus revived the department because he felt that thereby he could the better effect the consolidation and the permanent establishment of the State. If he had had the opposite opinion, he could as well have discontinued the department altogether. The very existence of the Church depends entirely upon the will and the whim of the State. Moreover, with the passing of the State, as in the instance of Tsarist Russia, the hope of the further continuance of the Church is in inverse proportion to the degree to which that Church is the creature and the tool of the State.

The life of such a Church depends upon that of the State, and has no claim upon the individual except insofar as the State levies taxes for its support. The individual of aesthetico-moral temperament may patronize it or attend its cult, according to his desires, but, as a department of State, it has no more personal claim upon him than the diplomatic corps, the department of forestry, the department of waterways, or any other agency through which the State functions. It can promise nothing to the individual, for the very basis of State activity, the greatest good of the greatest number, implies that there will be many who will not reap the good, and no individual has any assurance that he will be among the greatest number. The highest appeal of this Church is to loyalty,—the activity which is called into being in the absence of personal devotion and is never mentioned when personal devotion is foremost.

We in America are not familiar with this conception of the Church except as we meet it in our reading or in our travels. We know only that mild patronage of the State which is extended in the

form of remission of property taxes to every altruistic organization, charitable, educational or religious, and which enables many such organizations to continue their existence far beyond the limits of their usefulness. Nevertheless the conception obtains in many parts of the world today.

The second explanation of a Church is that of a confederation of like minded individuals with more or less lofty ideals and noble aims. The organization is like that of a school, a learned society or a charitable society; it may or may not be incorporated. Its purpose is that its members may give and receive mutual information and encouragement and that the ideas and ideals for which they stand may be disseminated. Such were the religious organizations of ancient Greece which proved, as might well be expected, hospitable soil for the cultivation of the many mysteries which arose after the break up of the Empire of Alexander.

Such a church must needs share in the finiteness of its members. Its ideals are no greater than that of the combined knowledge of the members, for which it is dependent entirely upon the discoveries of those members. If it has grown spontaneously, its ideals may change from time to time; if it was founded by some man, those ideals are limited to interpretations of his *dicta.*

The appeal of such a church is limited to those whose taste conforms to that of its members. There have been many such churches; there are many now. As with automobiles, one should easily find one suitable to his taste and his purse, and one is always privileged to walk if he prefers. The members of this church never really pass the stage of beneficent patrons who may be depended upon to continue their generosity so long as the institution conforms to their ideals. If it changes its purpose, as it conceivably may, they are entitled to withdraw their patronage and give it to another or withhold it entirely. Such a church is always at liberty to adjourn *sine die,* at the will and the whim of its members. Thus did the cults of ancient Greece gradually peter out and thus have many more recent cults arisen and dissolved.

Such a church may be a local unit or, like the Red Cross Society or a Greek letter fraternity, it may reach national proportions. The continuation of its existence will depend largely upon the extent of its geographical area. Its fundamental tenets will always be decided by some sort of majority vote. It may amend its constitution and erect prohibition into one of its basic beliefs; it may again amend that constitution and relegate prohibition to the limbo of forgotten doctrines. It may adopt any kind of rite as its method of admission or it need have no rite at all. Its whole constitution will depend upon the balloting of the majority of its members.

The American colonies were largely settled by men who had or who quickly developed this conception of a church and they proceeded to found their organizations and to multiply them until they became like the proverbial sands upon the seashore. A Russian critic said, a generation ago, that the average American reads his Bible in order to find the basis for the establishment of a new sect. He was probably exaggerating, but he may be pardoned for his inference.

One may like either of these conceptions of a church, but his devotion to the institution based upon either is, at best, precarious. He who can give himself completely and wholeheartedly to an institution whose very existence depends upon the favor or the prowess of the State has all the elements of a Stoic, but the limits of Stoicism have long since been recognized, and no one would seriously call it a religion. He who can yield his heart and soul to an organization which is dependent for its existence upon himself and his like minded associates can, at best, be but an Epicurean, and Epicureanism, like Stoicism, must lead to pessimism. There must always be a certain amount of conscious or unconscious reservation to the devotion so yielded. Even a generous endowment, which always enables an institution to outlive its usefulness, will not arouse a complete devotion, for endowments can be dissipated or confiscated.

The third kind of church is unique in Catholic Christendom, although it was distinctly heralded in the Judaism which preceded it. The word Catholic is here used to describe that form of Christianity which has obtained throughout some nineteen centuries and which is also the form which counts among its devotees today the majority of those who profess and call themselves Christians. If this word does not meet the approval of any, one should be perfectly willing to adopt any word which does meet that approval and is adequate for the purpose. The word "traditional" may adequately describe the vertical phase of the conception, but it does not touch the horizontal side. Nor does there seem to be a ready word to describe this horizontal phase; therefore the word "Catholic" is used to include both ideas with the cheerful acknowledgment of the willingness to substitute "x" if that does better duty.

The Catholic conception of the Church proceeds from the group consciousness that was evident among the original followers of the Lord Christ and was unquestionably fostered by the Lord Himself. This Christ group, or Church, was brought into being neither as a department of state nor as a federation of like minded individuals, but by God whose Holy Spirit came upon the original group of Christ followers who had received their commission from Christ himself. The Church, therefore, could adapt itself readily to any kind of state government, but was entirely independent of it and, if the State en-

croached upon it in any way, it could and did at all times resist that State. The first group was chosen by our Lord who said specifically, *Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you,* and to that group others have from time to time been added. Therefore, although the members might abandon the group, they could not dissolve it. The pedantic question was never raised, of what would happen if all the members abandoned the group, for such a possibility never arose and never will arise. The principles of the group life and worship were established by our Lord and whatever of value has arisen in the Church has been as natural an outgrowth of those principles as the apple is of the seed.

This group was not founded for the solidification of the State for it is entirely independent of it. In fact, it has survived all states and will survive many more. Neither does it exist for the mutual interchange of human opinions, but for the direction of those opinions into ways that lead to God. While it may alter, and has altered and will alter many of the details of its administration, it cannot alter the fundamental principles. For instance, it has altered the manner of baptism, but it cannot alter the fact of baptism. The only way by which men enter this Church is by being admitted by the Church itself. It was always recognized that others, who were not of the group, might cast out demons in Christ's name, but it was also recognized that casting out demons in Christ's name was not a criterion of oneness with the Lord.

In the early days of its life the Church determined certain characteristics which were to be the criteria by which the identity of any particular group with the historic group could be determined. The glad message of this group was not the greatest good of the greatest number, but salvation, union with God, for every one who would accept it.

To such a Church one could gladly yield himself. His very admission to it symbolized his union with the Apostles themselves. He could enthusiastically and devotedly proclaim its message and could commence and continue to travel the path that would lead to its realization. He could humbly and joyously enter upon its worship, which was not an epitome of human aspirations but a constant re-enactment of the perfect life, the blessed passion, the precious death, the mighty resurrection and the glorious ascension of the Lord himself. His constant aim was not to plunge about in quest of truth, but to understand and appreciate and apprehend the revelation of the Incarnate Lord who was the way, the truth and the life, and who *loved the Church and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify it and present the Church to himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish.*

This has been the conception of the Roman Catholic Church and was that of the Church of England even when, after the seventeenth century, its erastian leaders began to regard it more and more as a department of the State. It was the conception of the Scottish non-jurors. It was the conception of the Wesleys, whose father, Samuel, was a convert to the Church from non-conformity. It was the conception of Samuel Seabury, of William White and of John Henry Hobart, to mention only a few of the early American leaders. It was the conception in which John Keble, Hugh James Rose, Edward B. Pusey and Charles Marriot were reared. It was the conception which Richard Hurrell Froude and John Henry Newman became convinced was the real principle of the Church of England. They were further convinced that, unless the whole Church could be called back to what they felt was its very charter, the continuance of its life was precarious indeed.

There were two distinct questions in the 1830's: "What was the basic principle of the Church, as expressed in its life history and in its formularies?" and, "What was the conception which its leaders had of it?" The fact that the same answer could not be given to both these questions was the cause of the Oxford Movement. For, said Newman and Froude and Rose and their associates, the same reply must meet both queries. And, if the bishops and clergy entertained a conception different from that expressed in the Church's history and formularies, the recalcitrant leaders must be called to account, for they were endangering the Church which had been committed to them. Indeed, at the very moment, there was before the Parliament a bill which assumed that the Church was a department of the State. Hence, the outburst.

The difference between the course of the Oxford Movement,—the revival of the historic conception of the Church,—in England, and its course in America, was largely conditioned by the fact that in England the first interpretation of the Church was prevailing, while in America the second was common, albeit in both countries the third or basic conception was understood and maintained by many leaders. In England the conflict of the Catholic conception of the Church was with erastianism; in American it was with sectarianism.

If either the erastian or the sectarian interpretation of the Church is correct, the Church in both countries may well look forward to dissolution, which is the inevitable end of every sect and of every state cult. The Oxford Movement and the Catholic revival which it commenced based their activities upon the claim that neither erastianism nor sectarianism is in accord with the life history or with the formularies of the Church of England and of its American daughter.

In England the opposition to the Movement came from the strong arm of the State to which the erastian leaders of the Church appealed. A state is always loath to cede the control of any of its departments. This kind of opposition only drove the persecuted ones to greater exaggeration of the freedom of the Church from the State, and they naturally thought of a Church which was so entirely independent that it might even dream of the return of days when the Church could control the State. The reason that Roman fever is more endemic and more virulent in England than in America is that ultramontane Romanism is the very antithesis of erastianism; it is the reverse of which erastianism is the obverse, and the victims of obstinate erastianism go easily to the other extreme.

The recovery of the Catholic conception of the Church naturally brought in its train the revival of many elements of Catholic worship and life that had been obscured but not killed in the Church of England. They had also been retained in the Italian mission in England, which came from hiding in the same decade in which the Oxford Movement commenced, and which began, as the historian Francis Cornish puts it, "to present Catholicism in a dignified form and to clear away the squalor with which the Roman Church had been encumbered during three centuries of persecution or contempt".

Men who, like Newman and Manning, had been converted from the erastian to the Catholic conception, found in the now recognized Roman Church a body in which their ideas were welcome, and they naturally turned to it from a Church which seemed to them impatient of Catholic interpretation. Pusey and Keble and Rose and Marriot knew better than they for these came from families in which the old traditions of the Church had never died and, with them, the Catholic idea was not something new which they had embraced, but something old which had come to belated recognition.

The course of development has been slightly different in America where the question at issue has been not that of the characteristics of the historic Church but rather that of the very existence of such a Church. Traditions rest lightly upon us of whom the proudest can count his family tree for but ten generations, while, to the average American, his great grandfather is a biological hypothesis. In a history of eighteen hundred years of the Church, a lapse of two centuries was but an episode in its life development, but, during those two centuries, America had been unearthed and settled, chiefly by men who had been impatient with a Church that would not tolerate their new ideas and who had decided to get along without it. When churchmen came, bringing with them at least a few traditions of an historic body, their welcome was none too cordial among the sects that were growing apace. When, at the revolution,

many of the clergy had felt, by their ordination vows, bound to the mother country and the king, a new problem in religious adjustment was presented, for Americans were becoming obsessed with the new religion of patriotism which, for a century and a half, was to be almost synonymous with Anglophobia. When the churchmen in the new country organized the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, their organization was but one of many denominations which had similarly been established.

It was obvious, however, that this sect was different, for it had received its orders from the historic Church of the mother country and had embodied its religious expression in a Book of Common Prayer so similar to that of the Church of England that there was no mistaking the oneness of its traditions with those of that Church. Moreover, with the passing of the years, it became more and more evident that these traditions were part of the very life of the Church. Further, many of its leaders had been perfectly familiar with those traditions in their more rigid form, while one of its bishops had received his orders from the very non-jurors who had cherished them as the dearest of their possessions.

In the midst of an already sect ridden country which was to have its religious stream polluted by the wildest orgiastic revivalism and sincere but ignorant intellectual obscurantism, the entirely different life of the Church continued and deepened and spread, and the value of a traditional Christianity was gradually more appreciated. That it should be opposed might be expected; it was being opposed in the mother country; but there was no strong arm of the State to imprison men for saying their prayers in vestments with which magistrates were not familiar. The opposition, however, was based upon a literal legalism which, in spite of its activity and its energy, found its hold upon men gradually slipping.

There is in men a growing feeling which comes constantly forward, despite endeavours to suppress it, that truth has a habit of prevailing, and the American love of fairness has given to every protagonist of every kind of principle an opportunity to demonstrate whether his claims have any value. If, from time to time, there arise those who fain would crush or expel the villains who dare to think new ways of serving God, or to rethink old ways, they have, in the long run, their trouble for their pains, for we cannot help feeling in our souls that truth will vindicate itself. If these new or old ways of serving God are of no avail, they will slough off as leaves from the tree in autumn. If, perchance, they come from God himself who should be careful how we use our weapons. Americans have great sympathy with Gamaliel of old.

The theological features of the appeal of the Oxford Movement and the Catholic revival which it instituted have been rehearsed many

times. The central emphasis upon the Incarnation of our Lord, and the implications of the sacramental principle of religion have been explained with clarity and zeal. The average layman is about as interested in these as the layman of any other field is interested in the philosophical and technical background of the activities of that field. The layman is not as interested in the dictum that the causes of cancer are metabolistic rather than bacteriological as he is in the answer to the question, Can it be cured? As a layman one may have an academic interest in the chain of causes that prevent his carburetor from acting. What he really wants to know is how soon he can get his car started. The intelligent layman recognizes the importance of ultimate questions and the necessity for professionals to know their answers but, except in his own field, he must leave their quest to specialists. The layman wants particularly to know how the practical aspects of the Catholic revival contrast with other forms of religion. He is not satisfied with the explanation that Catholicity is accepted because of the rusticity or the unlearnedness of those who are exposed to it, for he sees it embraced by people who are both as urban and as intelligent as himself. There may be many reasons for this phenomenon, but there are two in particular which operate. (In this comparison the word *Catholic* is used in the sense already described and the word *Protestant* is used to depict any form of post-reformational Christianity.)

The first is the conception of worship. This is not the contrast of elaborateness with simplicity or of the aesthetic with the non-aesthetic. One can hardly imagine anything more elaborate than some Protestant services with all the accoutrements of a sacred concert, with their long parades of vested songsters and banners and flags and torches, and clergy resplendent in academic robes, and with anthems and solos and duets and instrumental renditions so interspersed with wordy prayers and Scripture readings and speeches that the bewildered auditor knows not what is coming next unless there is a platform announcer or a printed program to guide him through the maze. All this contrasts with the quiet simplicity of a Catholic Mass at an early morning hour. These two phenomena are compared not with the intention of appraisal as to which is better, but to illustrate that, when a Protestant goes in for elaborateness, he can be elaborate, and that a Catholic service is not necessarily elaborate.

The essential difference between a Protestant and a Catholic service is that the one is subjective and the other objective. The one has as its purpose the thrilling or the instructing or the inspiring of the worshipper; the purpose of the other is that the worshipper may himself do something for God in addition to telling him in speech and song how fine he is and has been and requesting him to continue

his favours. The effectiveness of any service may well be adjudged by the degree in which it accomplishes its purpose. The purpose of a Protestant service is accomplished if it makes the worshipper feel good; the purpose of a Catholic service is accomplished if the worshipper has done something. The Protestant service is subjective; the Catholic service is objective.

The appeal of a Protestant service is therefore to an individual's desire to be instructed or inspired. The appeal of a Catholic service is to his desire to do something or give something. And our Lord was philosophically right when he said, *It is more blessed to give than to receive*. Giving is a higher form of spiritual activity than receiving. Performance of duty is a higher spiritual act than gratification of desires. And because it is a higher form, it is more stable, more reliable. There might be conceivable moments when one does not feel an inclination for inspiration or instruction and, from the way in which the average Protestant service is attended, one seems justified in imagining that such moments are not rare. Nor can it be suggested that it is necessarily one's duty to want to be inspired. One does, however, recognize a duty to give or serve as wholly independent of his feelings.

The appeal of the average Protestant is to "go to Church" and this phrase is variously interpreted as to content. When the Catholic makes this appeal he means not "go to any kind of service", but "go to a specific kind of service". Moreover the general tendency of Catholic clergy is to arrange enough of the services so that there will be an opportunity for every man to do his duty. The only valid argument against the proposition of the Catholic is to demonstrate that the service to which he proposes attendance has not the higher spiritual order claimed for it, and, the more faithfully and the longer the Catholic attends his service, the more difficult this proof becomes.

The second reason for the practical appeal of the Catholic interpretation of religion is found in the more intimate association of the claims of the religion with the life of the devotee. Some two or three years ago a nationally famous Protestant leader was diagnosing the difficulties of Protestantism. Said he, "The great problem of Protestantism is not how to get men saved; that is comparatively easy. The great problem is what to do with them after they are saved". He elaborated his thesis by showing that the great appeal of his religion was that the individual should accomplish a certain spiritual experience, but that there was no concrete reason why men who had accomplished the experience should do any more, except be thankful for their experience. Issue was immediately taken with him by certain Protestant leaders present who were, however, unable to explain specifically what further steps their religious systems required of

their devotees. By their theologies the working of the grace of God is wholly separated from any relation to matter or material forms, and the abstract, immaterial something they call grace is almost indistinguishable from moral effort. The Protestant finds it difficult to say exactly what more is required of a man than that he live as morally as possible, and there is not always an agreement as to just what is the content of the moral ideal.

The Catholic devotee is called upon to keep the Church Year, with its round of feasts and fasts, and each of these is concretely defined. Fasting, for instance, is described not as an abstract doing without something when one feels he ought to, but takes definite form. Preparing to receive Holy Communion is not left to spontaneous inclination, but is given definite direction. Thanksgiving after Holy Communion is not left to the realm of abstract gratitude, but has definite content. Repentance from sins is not left to occasional sorrow which may take any form the penitent wishes, but is specifically described. Self examination is not a general appraisal of one's accomplishments and failures, but a careful comparison of one's self with an ideal. The grace of God,—the divine plus that is vouchsafed by God as a supplement to every moral effort,—is not an indefinite sort of generality left to the apprehensiveness of the devotee, but is concretely described and linked with definite religious acts. The Christian Ideal is not an inchoate idea which may take any expression or form desired, but is specifically delineated and solemnly proclaimed by act from the Altar as well as by word from the pulpit. And there is more likelihood of stability and certainty in the oft repeated act than in the temperamental word. Prayer is not the mere spontaneous expression of whatever ideas come into the mind of the Christian and therefore to be much neglected because of the paucity of ideas, but is given direction and form.

In short, to the Catholic, living the Christian life is a very definite and concrete thing which may be appreciated and apprehended, and there are degrees of accomplishment, depending upon the talents of the individual. It claims his attention, not merely for an idle hour one morning a week, but morning, noon and night and seven days in the week, for three hundred and sixty-five days in the year and three hundred and sixty-six in leap years. Our concern here is not with the rightness and wrongness of all this, but with the fact that it is. The average man prefers the concrete to the abstract, in life as in worship.

To the Catholic the fundamental necessity for the development of character is discipline, and discipline, to be discipline, must be sufficiently hard to be inconvenient. The Protestant tries to meet the convenience of his people; the Catholic frankly calls upon them

to inconvenience themselves. A prominent Protestant minister said recently that, in the Catholic's receiving Holy Communion fasting at seven o'clock in the morning, he saw symbolized that man's willingness to inconvenience himself for his God, "and that willingness," said he, "we Protestants do not have." The wideness of the acceptance of the Catholic appeal would seem to indicate that men are very willing to inconvenience themselves when they see their action pointing in a definite direction.

In indicating some of the bases of the appeal of the Catholic interpretation of religion, one should not be blind to its dangers, some of which have already appeared.

The chief danger is the insidious one of symbolic confusion. The discussion of this subject would itself require a whole evening's time and would suggest material for many more evenings' discussion. Suffice it to say that symbolism is one of the factors of Catholicity. We live in a world unquestionably material and quite as unquestionably spiritual. One of the great problems of religion, as well as of philosophy, is the relation between these two orders. The general tendency of men has been to regard one or the other of these as real and the other as illusory, or at least as ephemeral. Thus materialism is apt to scoff at the reality of the spiritual, and one might be surprised to learn just how much materialism has coloured religious interpretation. Most of orthodox post-reformational theology,—if one can speak of such a term,—has been unconsciously materialistic.

On the other hand, much of modernistic thinking has erred as much on the other side and has thought of religion as dealing with the spiritual realm to the exclusion of the material. Orthodox Catholicity has always regarded the two realms as equally real and has recognized that, as far as *we* are concerned and can understand or conceive, the spiritual realm functions only through the material. If it has erred on the materialistic side at times, it has never erred on the spiritualistic side and, for instance, interpreted the resurrection of the body as meaning the resurrection of the soul which does not die and presumably does not need resurrecting. On the practical side Catholicity has always insisted that, at least as far as this life is concerned, all attempts to separate the material and the spiritual result in philosophical and religious contradiction. It therefore regards the grace of God as working through the sacraments, which are defined in the Prayer Book as "means of grace" as well as "pledges to assure us thereof".

The sacraments, from one point of view, may be described as symbols if one remembers that it is impossible to separate the symbol from the thing symbolized. There is no such thing as a "mere symbol". The danger of Protestantism is that of symbolic separation,—that is, the attempt to separate the symbol from the thing symbolized,

and to insist upon the value of the latter and the consequent uselessness of the former. This leads to a disregard of the sacraments; for this reason the Quakers are logical and consistent. Most post-reformational churches have rites which they call sacraments but, in their zeal to explain what they do not mean by sacraments, they are often at a loss to specify just what they do mean by them. The Quakers avoid this difficulty by not having sacraments at all. Then nature has its revenge upon them in their symbolic speech, their symbolic dress and many other minor bits of symbolism by which they symbolize their disbelief in symbolism.

The danger of the Catholic is the very opposite, that of symbolic confusion. He is likely to confuse the symbol with the thing symbolized and to lose the spiritual significance of the sacraments. The danger of symbolism is mechanical formalism; the danger of the lack of symbolism is that the thing symbolized may easily disappear with the symbol, and the last state of the man be worse than the first. Religious leaders have long been divided into two groups, the one decrying the emptiness of life that threatens the use of symbolism, the other decrying the emptiness of life that threatens the disregard of it. The problem is not as easy to solve as to propound and the last word has not yet been spoken. It should be frankly recognized, however, that Protestantism embodies one of these dangers and Catholicity the other. We are all human.

This fact suggests the second danger of the Catholic revival. In selecting the word "Catholic" to describe the traditional and world extensive form of Christianity, we selected one of the most inclusive words imaginable. Coming from the ancient Greek, it means *whole, universal, total.* The danger is illustrated in the use of that offensive word "Catholicism", which all have heard too frequently. As so used the word has often described just one more denomination, as exclusive as the word *Catholic* is inclusive, and to make the truths of the spiritual order the shibboleths of an almost esoteric sect. The danger is exactly that which appears in every war, when each country assumes that "we are all right and they are all wrong".

It is shown in the thinly veiled contempt (and the veil is sometimes torn away entirely) with which the word Protestant is pronounced, as if it were the concentrated quintessence of falsehood, ugliness and evil. Catholics are apt to forget that the revolt against the organization which did so much to preserve Catholicity was based upon very real grounds. That organization had become so steeped in symbolic confusion on its official side that something just had to happen.

We must remember that Protestantism, while it is undoubtedly destined to disappear, has served a wonderful purpose and that its

champions have been marked by as great sincerity and devotion to their cause as were ever exemplified by any Catholic. And, if Protestantism is destined to disappear, *Catholic-ism* shares that selfsame destiny, and the Kingdom of God will not be realized until God is all and in all.

One final danger of Anglican Catholicity is the expression of an inferiority complex toward our own Church,—the reverse of the danger incurred by *Protestant* Episcopalians. It would seem that our Church has just two extreme schools of thought, the one insisting that the Church is too Protestant and the other insisting that it is too Episcopal. The former group casts longing eyes at anything that comes from the Tiber, upon the assumption that nothing but good can come therefrom. It hesitates at meeting the rigid disciplinary requirements of the Tibernian conditions of union, but hesitates at little else. The latter group casts equally longing eyes at the Federation of Churches and would, if not restrained, make our Church an element in the religious goulash which seems to be the hope of Protestantism.

If Protestants make serious mistakes which endanger the very being of our Church and threaten chaos, they who call themselves Catholics have not always proved to be God appointed guides in evoking the order that is desired. We should remember that our Church is not a federation, but a body in which are many members. The business of every member is not only to function aright himself, but so to influence the other members that they too will function aright, bearing in mind that, while the whole is greater than the sum of its parts, that whole cannot be realized if any of the parts be lacking. It is not easy always to know what to do with a runaway four-in-hand, but at least the good driver will try not to kill any of the horses.

The goal is not yet reached. We have not yet attained God's plan. Perchance the hour calls us to our knees that the Holy Spirit may in all things direct and rule our hearts, that God's kingdom may come and his will be done on earth as it is in heaven. In the accomplishment of this great desideratum the Catholic Church has a necessary function and the Catholic revival has done much to clarify the understanding of that function. May it continue its work until the kingdoms of the earth have become the kingdom of our God and of his Christ.